

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

DOCKETED ⁰²

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH
& REYNOLDS, P.C.
Attn. Carroll, Alice O.
530 Virginia Road
P.O. Box 9133
Concord, MA 01742-9133
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND
THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION

(PCT Rule 44.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	09/11/2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 3194.1026004	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraphs 1 and 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2004/017251	International filing date (day/month/year) 01/06/2004
Applicant MYKROLIS CORPORATION	FOREIGN DOCKETING

Completed By _____

1. ☒ The applicant is hereby notified that the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority have been established and are transmitted herewith.

Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:

The applicant is entitled, if he so wishes, to amend the claims of the international Application (see Rule 46):

When? The time limit for filing such amendments is normally 2 months from the date of transmittal of the International Search Report; however, for more details, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

Where? Directly to the International Bureau of WIPO, 34 chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile No.: (41-22) 740.14.35

For more detailed instructions, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

2. ☐ The applicant is hereby notified that no international search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.
3. ☐ **With regard to the protest** against payment of (an) additional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:

- ☐ the protest together with the decision thereon has been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the applicant's request to forward the texts of both the protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.
- ☐ no decision has been made yet on the protest; the applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.

4. Reminders

Shortly after the expiration of **18 months** from the priority date, the international application will be published by the International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or postpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international application, or of the priority claim, must reach the International Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication.

The applicant may submit comments on an informal basis on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the International Bureau. The International Bureau will send a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an international preliminary examination report has been or is to be established. These comments would also be made available to the public but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.

Within **19 months** from the priority date, but only in respect of some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone the entry into the national phase until **30 months** from the priority date (in some Offices even later); otherwise, the applicant must, **within 20 months** from the priority date, perform the prescribed acts for entry into the national phase before those designated Offices.

In respect of other designated Offices, the time limit of **30 months** (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19 months.

See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet site.

Rec'd IFD

Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority



European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Véronique Baillou NOV 18 2004

NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220

These Notes are intended to give the basic instructions concerning the filing of amendments under article 19. The Notes are based on the requirements of the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Regulations and the Administrative Instructions under that Treaty. In case of discrepancy between these Notes and those requirements, the latter are applicable. For more detailed information, see also the PCT Applicant's Guide, a publication of WIPO.

In these Notes, "Article", "Rule", and "Section" refer to the provisions of the PCT, the PCT Regulations and the PCT Administrative Instructions respectively.

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING AMENDMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 19

The applicant has, after having received the international search report, one opportunity to amend the claims of the international application. It should however be emphasized that, since all parts of the international application (claims, description and drawings) may be amended during the international preliminary examination procedure, there is usually no need to file amendments of the claims under Article 19 except where, e.g. the applicant wants the latter to be published for the purposes of provisional protection or has another reason for amending the claims before international publication. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that provisional protection is available in some States only.

What parts of the international application may be amended?

Under Article 19, only the claims may be amended.

During the international phase, the claims may also be amended (or further amended) under Article 34 before the International Preliminary Examining Authority. The description and drawings may only be amended under Article 34 before the International Examining Authority.

Upon entry into the national phase, all parts of the international application may be amended under Article 28 or, where applicable, Article 41.

When?

Within 2 months from the date of transmittal of the international search report or 16 months from the priority date, whichever time limit expires later. It should be noted, however, that the amendments will be considered as having been received on time if they are received by the International Bureau after the expiration of the applicable time limit but before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication (Rule 46.1).

Where not to file the amendments?

The amendments may only be filed with the International Bureau and not with the receiving Office or the International Searching Authority (Rule 46.2).

Where a demand for international preliminary examination has been/is filed, see below.

How?

Either by cancelling one or more entire claims, by adding one or more new claims or by amending the text of one or more of the claims as filed.

A replacement sheet must be submitted for each sheet of the claims which, on account of an amendment or amendments, differs from the sheet originally filed.

All the claims appearing on a replacement sheet must be numbered in Arabic numerals. Where a claim is cancelled, no renumbering of the other claims is required. In all cases where claims are renumbered, they must be renumbered consecutively (Administrative Instructions, Section 205(b)).

The amendments must be made in the language in which the international application is to be published.

What documents must/may accompany the amendments?

Letter (Section 205(b)):

The amendments must be submitted with a letter.

The letter will not be published with the international application and the amended claims. It should not be confused with the "Statement under Article 19(1)" (see below, under "Statement under Article 19(1)").

The letter must be in English or French, at the choice of the applicant. However, if the language of the international application is English, the letter must be in English; if the language of the international application is French, the letter must be in French.

NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220 (continued)

The letter must indicate the differences between the claims as filed and the claims as amended. It must, in particular, indicate, in connection with each claim appearing in the international application (it being understood that identical indications concerning several claims may be grouped), whether

- (i) the claim is unchanged;
- (ii) the claim is cancelled;
- (iii) the claim is new;
- (iv) the claim replaces one or more claims as filed;
- (v) the claim is the result of the division of a claim as filed.

The following examples illustrate the manner in which amendments must be explained in the accompanying letter:

1. [Where originally there were 48 claims and after amendment of some claims there are 51]:
"Claims 1 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 to 48 replaced by amended claims bearing the same numbers; claims 30, 33 and 36 unchanged; new claims 49 to 51 added."
2. [Where originally there were 15 claims and after amendment of all claims there are 11]:
"Claims 1 to 15 replaced by amended claims 1 to 11."
3. [Where originally there were 14 claims and the amendments consist in cancelling some claims and in adding new claims]:
"Claims 1 to 6 and 14 unchanged; claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added." or
"Claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added; all other claims unchanged."
4. [Where various kinds of amendments are made]:
"Claims 1-10 unchanged; claims 11 to 13, 18 and 19 cancelled; claims 14, 15 and 16 replaced by amended claim 14; claim 17 subdivided into amended claims 15, 16 and 17; new claims 20 and 21 added."

"Statement under article 19(1)" (Rule 46.4)

The amendments may be accompanied by a statement explaining the amendments and indicating any impact that such amendments might have on the description and the drawings (which cannot be amended under Article 19(1)).

The statement will be published with the international application and the amended claims.

It must be in the language in which the international application is to be published.

It must be brief, not exceeding 500 words if in English or if translated into English.

It should not be confused with and does not replace the letter indicating the differences between the claims as filed and as amended. It must be filed on a separate sheet and must be identified as such by a heading, preferably by using the words "Statement under Article 19(1)."

It may not contain any disparaging comments on the international search report or the relevance of citations contained in that report. Reference to citations, relevant to a given claim, contained in the international search report may be made only in connection with an amendment of that claim.

Consequence if a demand for international preliminary examination has already been filed

If, at the time of filing any amendments under Article 19, a demand for international preliminary examination has already been submitted, the applicant must preferably, at the same time of filing the amendments with the International Bureau, also file a copy of such amendments with the International Preliminary Examining Authority (see Rule 62.2(a), first sentence).

Consequence with regard to translation of the international application for entry into the national phase

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that, where upon entry into the national phase, a translation of the claims as amended under Article 19 may have to be furnished to the designated/elected Offices, instead of, or in addition to, the translation of the claims as filed.

For further details on the requirements of each designated/elected Office, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 3194.1026004	FOR FURTHER ACTION see Form PCT/ISA/220 as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.	
International application No. PCT/US2004/017251	International filing date (day/month/year) 01/06/2004	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year) 02/06/2003
Applicant MYKROLIS CORPORATION		

This International Search Report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This International Search Report consists of a total of 4 sheets.

☒ It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

1. **Basis of the report**

a. With regard to the **language**, the international search was carried out on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ The international search was carried out on the basis of a translation of the international application furnished to this Authority (Rule 23.1(b)).

b. ☐ With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, see Box No. I.

2. ☐ **Certain claims were found unsearchable** (See Box II).

3. ☐ **Unity of invention is lacking** (see Box III).

4. With regard to the **title**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

5. With regard to the **abstract**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this international search report, submit comments to this Authority.

6. With regards to the **drawings**,

a. the figure of the **drawings** to be published with the abstract is Figure No. _____

☐ as suggested by the applicant.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because this figure better characterizes the invention.

b. ☒ none of the figures is to be published with the abstract.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/US2004/017251

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
 IPC 7 H01L21/306 B01D53/00 B01D53/72

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
 IPC 7 H01L B01D

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, WPI Data, PAJ

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	WO 01/37329 A (LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC) 25 May 2001 (2001-05-25)	1
A	page 4, lines 15,16; claims 1-9	2-35
A	EP 0 867 924 A (IMEC INTER UNI MICRO ELECTR) 30 September 1998 (1998-09-30) claims 1-26	1-35
A	US 2002/088478 A1 (DEGENDT STEFAN ET AL) 11 July 2002 (2002-07-11) claims 1-49	1-35
A	DE 199 24 058 A (BOSCH GMBH ROBERT) 30 November 2000 (2000-11-30) claims 1-18	1-35
	----- -/--	

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

* Special categories of cited documents :

A document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

E earlier document but published on or after the international filing date

L document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

O document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

P document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

T later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

X document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

Y document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

* & * document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

28 October 2004

Date of mailing of the international search report

09/11/2004

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
 NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
 Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
 Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Kanoldt, W

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/US2004/017251

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	US 6 124 211 A (BUTTERBAUGH JEFFERY W ET AL) 26 September 2000 (2000-09-26) claims 1-21; example 12 -----	1-35
A	US 5 938 854 A (ROTH JOHN REECE) 17 August 1999 (1999-08-17) claims 1-49 -----	1-35
A	US 5 230 721 A (OHMI TADAHIO) 27 July 1993 (1993-07-27) claims 1-7 -----	1-35

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/US2004/017251

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
WO 0137329	A	25-05-2001	AU 1604501 A WO 0137329 A1 US 6588437 B1	30-05-2001 25-05-2001 08-07-2003
EP 0867924	A	30-09-1998	EP 0867924 A2 US 2002088478 A1 US 6551409 B1 US 2002011257 A1 JP 11219926 A	30-09-1998 11-07-2002 22-04-2003 31-01-2002 10-08-1999
US 2002088478	A1	11-07-2002	US 2002130106 A1 US 6551409 B1 US 2001042559 A1 US 2002011257 A1 EP 0867924 A2 JP 11219926 A	19-09-2002 22-04-2003 22-11-2001 31-01-2002 30-09-1998 10-08-1999
DE 19924058	A	30-11-2000	DE 19924058 A1	30-11-2000
US 6124211	A	26-09-2000	EP 0801606 A1 JP 10513612 T WO 9713646 A1 EP 0688045 A1 JP 8064559 A US 5534107 A US 5580421 A US 5716495 A US 6015503 A	22-10-1997 22-12-1998 17-04-1997 20-12-1995 08-03-1996 09-07-1996 03-12-1996 10-02-1998 18-01-2000
US 5938854	A	17-08-1999	US 5456972 A US 5669583 A AU 695099 B2 AU 6148496 A CA 2222620 A1 EP 0828618 A1 JP 11507990 T WO 9638311 A1 AU 679237 B2 AU 6962394 A CA 2163967 A1 EP 0700577 A1 JP 8511898 T RU 2154363 C2 WO 9428568 A1 US 5403453 A US 6146724 A	10-10-1995 23-09-1997 06-08-1998 18-12-1996 05-12-1996 18-03-1998 13-07-1999 05-12-1996 26-06-1997 20-12-1994 08-12-1994 13-03-1996 10-12-1996 10-08-2000 08-12-1994 04-04-1995 14-11-2000
US 5230721	A	27-07-1993	JP 63014414 A	21-01-1988

- 1.4 From the description, it can be concluded (see pages 8, 9) that the purified purge gas shall contain, beside inert gases, "active" gases showing a chemical effect. Only water and oxygen are named and their effectiveness is demonstrated in the examples. From the description it is also clear that no other impacting effects like plasma or radiation or the use of known more aggressive gases like chlorine shall be applied. But the claims are not restricted to these disclosed features. All additional energetic and chemical effects which are apparently not meant, are in addition possible according to the formulation of the claims.
- 1.5 In the following, the claims are read as concerning the removal of hydrocarbons from high purity products such as silicon wafers.

Re Item V:

1. The following document is referred to in this communication:
- D1 : WO 01/37329 A (LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC) 25 May 2001 (2001-05-25)
D2 : EP 0 867 924 A (IMEC INTER UNI MICRO ELECTR) 30 September 1998 (1998-09-30)
D3 : US 2002/088478 A1 (DEGENDT STEFAN ET AL) 11 July 2002 (2002-07-11)
D4 : DE 199 24 058 A (BOSCH GMBH ROBERT) 30 November 2000 (2000-11-30)
D5 : US 6 124 211 A (BUTTERBAUGH JEFFERY W ET AL) 26 September 2000 (2000-09-26)
D6 : US 5 938 854 A (ROTH JOHN REECE) 17 August 1999 (1999-08-17)
- 2.1 As the claims are not clear (see above) only a more general statement to present claim 1 in view of the above clarifications (see re item VIII, 1.5, above) can be given.
- 2.2 Document D1 is regarded to perform the closest present prior art. It shows (see p. 4, ls. 15, 16; claims 1 - 9, 36) a method for the removal of airborne hydrocarbons from a wafer surface comprising purifying a portion of the wafer surface with a gas

containing water vapor. The taking up of hydrocarbons (and respective reaction products) producing a contaminated purge gas and the removal of this purge gas is self-evident.

Claim 1 differs in that the purge gas before contacting shall have a purity of less than 1 vol-ppb AMCs.

Thus, claim 1 is novel (Article 33(2) PCT), but no inventive activity can be acknowledged (Article 33(3) PCT), as it is known to a skilled person (application, page 8, ls. 26 -31) that in order to finally purge a wafer surface, it is necessary to have a UHP gas. Otherwise, the required purity - either after physical rinsing or chemical removing from contaminants - cannot be reached.

In D1, no purity is given. As already mentioned, the skilled man knows that in case of a final purification (e.g. before using the wafer in chip production) step, the required surface purity can only be achieved when the treating gas does not contain more impurities than the usual gas atmosphere in the further production step.

- 2.3 Documents D2 - D6 show all a similar prior art. The main difference is that the origine of the hydrocarbons is not expressed, what is not regarded as essential.
- 2.4 Concerning the other claims (2 - 35), in view of the unclear formulations (see 2.1, above) it can only be said that these claims seem to contain solution details which cannot be regarded as inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

The industrial applicability (Article 33(4) PCT) is beyond doubt.

Re Item VII:

1. No relevant prior art documents are mentioned in the introduction of the description

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2004/017251

International filing date (day/month/year)
01.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
02.06.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H01L21/306, B01D53/00, B01D53/72

Applicant
MYKROLIS CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Kanoldt, W

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8633



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/017251

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/017251

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ . copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-35
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-35
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-35
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item VIII:

1. The claims are not clear (Article 6 PCT) as follows:
 - 1.1 It is not understood why more than one independent claim in the same category is necessary. The various definitions of the invention given in the independent claims 1, 2, 16 and 24 are such that the claims as a whole are not clear and concise, contrary to Article 6 PCT. The claims should be recast to include only the minimum necessary number of independent claims in any one category, Rule 13.3 PCT, with dependent claims as appropriate, Rule 6.4 PCT.

Claim 1 is regarded as the broadest claim. The other independent claims could apparently be formulated dependent on this claim.

- 1.2 In the chapter "summary of the invention" the independent claims are reflected. But some of the features (see p. 4, 32 and p. 5, l. 12) are preferable according to the description, but obligatory in the corresponding claims. Thus, the claims are not clear in the light of the description.

Moreover, the dependent claims are not reflected completely in the description and thus are not supported.

- 1.3 In the description, the problem to be solved (page 4, ls. 29, 30) is described as to provide a method for the removal of AMCs from surfaces. But in the examples, exclusively different hydrocarbons are removed. Thus, a generalization to all possible AMCs is regarded to be speculative. In this context, the explanation concerning AMCs given on page 2 is misleading, as also moisture and oxygen is included in the open list of possible AMCs, but in the following sentence these two substances are excluded. This contradiction makes the expression "AMC" not clear.

From the first chapter of the description it becomes immediately clear that the application concerns the removal of substances on surfaces of high purity products such as silicon wafers. Contrary to this, the independent claims only mention a "surface" in general. Thus, the "surfaces" are not clearly defined in the claims.